

CITY OF SAN BRUNO



567 El Camino Real
San Bruno, CA 94066
Voice: (650) 616-7074
Fax: (650) 873-6749
<http://www.ci.sanbruno.ca.us>

STAFF

Tambri Heyden, AICP, *Community Development Director*
Aaron Aknin, AICP, *Planning Manager*
Mark Sullivan, AICP, *Housing and Redevelopment Manager*
Beilin Yu, *Associate Planner*
Tony Rozzi, *Assistant Planner*
Lisa Costa-Sanders, *Contract Planner*
Cathy Hidalgo, *Recording Secretary*
Pamela Thompson, *City Attorney*

PLANNING

COMMISSIONERS

Sujendra Mishra, *Chair*
Rick Biasotti, *Vice-Chair*
Commissioners:
Mary Lou Johnson
Bob Marshall Jr.
Perry Petersen
Kevin Chase
Joe Sammut

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

April 18, 2006

San Bruno Senior Center
1555 Crystal Springs Blvd.
7:00 P.M. to 10:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER at 7:02 pm.

ROLL CALL

	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Chair Mishra	X	
Vice Chair Biasotti	X	
Commissioner Chase		X
Commissioner Johnson		X
Commissioner Marshall		X
Commissioner Petersen	X	
Commissioner Sammut	X	

STAFF PRESENT:

Planning Division: Community Development Director: Tambri Heyden
Planning Manager: Aaron Aknin
Associate Planner: Beilin Yu
Assistant Planner: Tony Rozzi
Community Dev. Recording Secretary: Cathy Hidalgo
City Attorney: Pamela Thompson

Pledge of Allegiance: Associate Planner Beilin Yu

A. Approval of Minutes – March 21, 2006

Motion to Approve Minutes of March 21, 2006 Planning Commission meeting.

Sammut/Biasotti

VOTE: 4-0
AYES: All Commissioners Present
NOES:
ABSTAIN:

B. Communication

None at this time.

C. Public Comment

None at this time.

D. Announcement of Conflict of Interest

Commissioner Biasiotti, Recuse from Item E5

Commissioner Chase now Present

E. Public Hearings

1. 2550 Catalpa Way

Request for a Use Permit to allow the construction of an addition to an existing residence that increases the floor area by more than 50% per Section 12.200.030.B.1 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. A. Gordon Atkinson (Applicant) / Ruby O'Brien (Owner). UP-05-24

Planning Manager Akin entered staff report. Not before the planning commission "more than 6 for the senior care facility" tonight. Petition received on the facility care center.

Staff Recommends approval of Use Permit 05-24, based on Findings of Fact 1-7 and Conditions of Approval 1-24.

Chair Mishra asked Commission if there were any questions for staff.

Commissioner Petersen: This looks like a tear down and a replacement, rather than an expansion.

Planning Manager Akin: Responded. Architect can expand more on the structural components. Understands it is an addition, not a tear down.

Commissioner Petersen: Referring to this project as a single-family home.

Planning Manager Akin: Responded yes.

Commissioner Petersen: Is it fair to say it is an unusual single family home, based on the layout?

Planning Manager Akin: Responded, in terms of floor area, and lot coverage it is not unusual, however, based on floor plan, it is unusual.

Chair Mishra asked the applicant to address the Commission and introduce the project.

Applicant: Applicant introduced herself as Ruby O'Brien. Has 5 care homes in San Bruno, operations began in 1990-. Owner of property. Intends to use home as senior care facility up to 6 residents at this time. Introduced Architect Gordon Atkinson. Architect stated that they are expanding the building, designed as a residential care facility for elderly. Existing structure will stand, interior partitions will change, the addition is all in the rear of the property, will be landscaped. The Exterior will be renovated with stucco, moldings, paint, new windows, brick veneer at foundation. Will look similar to Eucalyptus facility. Architect thinks it will be a great improvement to the property and a nice addition to the neighborhood.

Chair Mishra: Asked applicant if they read and accept conditions of approval.

Architect: Responded yes.

Commissioner Petersen: On sheet A3, it is titled First Floor Plan, why is it titled so, is there a 2nd floor planner or is there a basement?

Architect: No, just a first floor

Commissioner Petersen: Doesn't ever recall a set of plans titled first floor when there wasn't a 2nd level, either a basement level or a split level, or something like that. Curious why it is titled "first floor plan"?

Architect: Responded that there are Occasions when there may be an unoccupied 1st floor, and the only floor plan provided would be on a different level, just to clarify the fact that it is the ground floor.

Commissioner Petersen: Clarification that there is not a second sheet missing. Questioned Architect if they were planning a 2nd floor in the future.

Architect: Responded No to missing sheet. Responded no, they are not planning a 2nd floor in the future.

Chair Mishra: seeing elevation, A4, brick veneer in the old elevation, is that correct?

Architect: Responded yes.

Chair Mishra: Since you are re-doing the entire exterior, do you mind having that veneer going throughout all the elevations?

Architect: Responded that the problem with that is the lot slopes front to back so the portion that is covered in brick veneer is the concrete foundation of the building and the grade is higher in the back so the concrete foundation isn't exposed. So there is no concrete to cover with the brick veneer, it is difficult to cover the walls above the foundation level causes Architectural problems.

Chair Mishra: What about the South elevation?

Architect: Responded yes, on the South elevation can continue it until it disappears in the grade, if that is your request, then certainly that would be no problem at all.

Chair Mishra: Approved.

Commissioner Sammut: Question, the public discussion on this is only going to pertain on the structure, not on the use of the structure, as we don't mandate use, the city does not control that, correct?

Chair Mishra: Correct.

Public Comment opened.

Public Speaker #1: Alan Lubke, 2550 Fleetwood Drive. Addressed the commission and states: "Applicant Atkinson and owner O'Brien are thumbing their nose at you this evening. I hope you understand that expression. They claim to be good neighbors and will comply with your guidelines. They are thumbing their nose at you this evening. They ignored both of the conditions placed on them at their property on Eucalyptus while proceeding with this new request on Catalpa Way. Last time I spoke here, I

talked about one of those and that was leaving those bright lights on and after I spoke the day after those lights went off. I am not requesting, this time, I am demanding that you stop action on this application right now until the applicant and the owner comply with the restrictions placed on them on the property on Eucalyptus. The second condition was that they use the garage for parking and not for storage. I was over there this afternoon and in that garage there are wheel chairs and walkers and no cars. How many months is this going to go on? You can see what they are doing. They are not going to comply with what you tell them this evening because they have failed to do so in the past. That's why I demand, not request, demand that the action be ceased right now on this application until they comply with the restrictions you placed on the first one. How did they ever pass inspection on that property? I went over there this afternoon and took a picture of the driveway, which has been in deplorable condition ever since this property was constructed. It has a huge crack in the concrete and a huge basin and this has been in existence since day one. What kind of contractor doesn't fix that? (Presents Pictures to the commission). The second picture is a two feet of growth out of the gutters. The only home in San Bruno that's using their gutters as a planter instead of using it for water drainage."

Public Speaker #2: Mike Amato, 2600 Fleetwood Drive. Addressed the commission and states: "I am opposed to this permit application. Reviewing the staff report, I question the finding that this building will be consistent to the areas general plan. This is basically a monster size house and will be twice the size of any house, the average house in that area and basically run as a for profit business. It is not a residence it is a for profit business. But, most of all, I am upset with this because I find it dubious that the applicant here is claiming that there is only going to be six residents that will live in this huge building. Giving that the plan before you has eight proposed bedrooms and 2 additional rooms that can be easily converted into bedrooms. And, given that we know what happened at Eucalyptus property, it is on the record that it was basically converted from a six bedroom to an eight bedroom unit, it wouldn't surprise me if this will be a larger residential facility that what is being proposed to you tonight. I think if the applicant here is proposing that this is only going to be for 6 residents, then that should be clearly spelt out in your approval tonight, if you are going to approve this, that this is only for 6 residents. I don't see that in the report. I see the applicant making the claim but I do not see anything in there that puts that as a condition of use for the property. I recommend that condition number 6 be amended to say 'the residence shall be use as a single family residence dwelling for 6 residence only'."

Public Speaker #3: Mara Amota, 2600 Fleetwood Drive. Addressed the commission and states: "I am concerned about this place because there is eight bedrooms and if there are suppose to be 2 employees, one should be watching the clients and I can't see two bedrooms being used for two employees at one time. I would like this specified in their paperwork as well. As in the other place it is going to go from 6 to 8 under our nose which is not a residential neighborhood thing. It's supposed to be only 6. Unless I get a key to the place and go check it out, I am very mistrustful about this whole idea. If an employee is going to be sleeping during the night, who is watching the clients? They could be setting off fires or whatever when the others are asleep."

More people more profit and that is my concern. It is not a residential idea, or a good idea for our neighborhood.

Chair Mishra: Would like to remind everyone that we are questioning the structure versus the use of the structure.

Public Speaker #4: Susan Santiago, 2551 Catalpa Way. Addressed the commission and states: "I live directly across the street from this project. I feel the building structure they have proposed is much larger than any of the homes on our block. It definitely would not fit in with the other homes. This is not just a little addition. This is turning a single-family home into a multi-family compound. It is quite obvious that this structure will be turned into a large facility. I am asking you to consider the families that live on Catalpa, who bought their homes as single-family residences in a residential neighborhood, and our daily lives and how wrong a big structure like this is in our neighborhood. Thank you."

Public Speaker #5: Lloyd Chaney, 2610 Fleetwood Drive. Addressed the commission and states: "I am all in favor of facilities for Senior Citizens and a matter of fact, this building we are in, an outstanding project the city did for the Seniors. My daughter had her wedding reception in this very area about 12 years ago. As far as building other facilities for seniors, I am all for it, however, I do not see this in the respect that it is only done for profit and not just to help the seniors. Thank you."

Public Comment closed.

Vice Chair Biasotti: To Staff, do we have any knowledge of what restrictions the first speaker was talking about on Eucalyptus?

Planning Manager Akin: Responded that he believed he was talking about the employee's cars being parked in the garage.

Vice Chair Biasotti: Do we have information on that?

Planning Manager Akin: Responded that he believes they are. He has done a drive by and hasn't seen cars in the driveway. Hasn't physically looked in the garage though.

Vice Chair Biasotti: Comments the number of clients is governed by state board, rather than city.

Planning Manager Akin: Responded correct. Governed by state ordinance as well as local ordinance. In this case our local ordinance says If you have more than 6 residents at the facility they must get planning commission approval, so in fact we can place a condition on this that states if you propose more than 6 clients at this facility, further planning commission review is required.

Vice Chair Biasotti: Proposes that conditioning tonight.

Commissioner Petersen: To Staff. As it stands right now, there is no regulation in the city that regulates the number of bedrooms or even rooms in a single-family house, correct? The same would be through for bathrooms. So, every bedroom could have a bathroom and that would be within the code. In fact, this application, meets the lot coverage and floor ratio requirements and the parking requirements. So the only reason it is here is because it is greater than 50% expansion.

Planning Manager Akin: agreed

Chair Mishra: To staff, looking at floor plan, you will see it has a storage with a storage unit and it is with a window. Condition to remove that storage and block that window up to make it a complete storage unit.

Planning Manager Akin: Yes, we could put that as a condition. Understands since they have 6 beds they did want to make this into a bedroom per the building code, but will be used as storage for the time being. If it does have a window and it does have a closet it has to meet the building code for a sleeping room however, if you want to close the window and close of the closet then it wouldn't have to meet building code.

Chair Mishra: Would like it to be just a storage room.

Planning Manager Akin: Agreed.

Chair Mishra: What is the code of the ratio of the number of residents to number of staff bedroom.

Planning Manager Akin: It is 2 if it non-ambulatory and one if it is ambulatory for every 6 residents.

Chair Mishra: Closet in office, considered a bedroom

Planning Manager Akin: If there is a closet, it is considered a Bedroom, has to meet UBC definitions of a bedroom and window has to meet egress requirements.

Chair Mishra: In arc we were questioning the stairs impeding into the 20x20 garage area, is that still the case because I see no dimension.

Planning Manager Akin: No longer impedes, because they have more than 20 feet wide there to do that and it is also pre existing condition.

Motion to approve Use Permit 05-24, based on Findings of Fact 1-7 and Conditions of Approval 1-24 (Chair Mishra amends to Conditions of Approval to 26)

Discussion:

Commissioner Petersen to chair: Explained the vote. Commission is making decisions based on the zoning ordinance and other rules and regulations of the City of San Bruno and there have been other applications that relate to residential care facilities and those facilities are covered by both State and Local Law. If you find the decisions that we make to be other than what you feel to be appropriate, one way to address that is by discussing it with your councilpersons and they can possibly change the zoning ordinance. But there are significant laws about what the city can and cannot do. He recognizes the public's concerns and sentiments and at the same time, it is important for you to think about the actual effects. One speaker mentioned that a home in use in another part of the city is not meeting the regulations; staff will be looking into that. His experience, while going through an application and approve it, Staff does follow up and that there are many homes like this in San Bruno that are not objectionable, which is no guarantee that this will or will not be. From his perspective wanted to make these statements to the public to help them understand the way decisions are made.

Commissioner Chase to chair: Commended Commissioner Petersen's explanation. States that The Planning Commission must follow guidelines. Must follow legalities and not become emotionally involved, understanding though the public's feelings.

Commissioner Sammut/Commissioner Petersen

VOTE: 5-0
AYES: All Commissioners Present
NOES:
ABSTAIN:

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
2. The addition will not under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use given proposed conditions.
3. The addition will not be injurious or detrimental to property and improvement in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city since the proposed structure will blend in well with the existing character of the neighborhood.
4. The general appearance of the proposed addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the design, scale and materials will match the materials found in the immediate neighborhood and the proportions of the house are similar to other houses in the neighborhood.
5. Because the proposed addition meets all minimum setback requirements per the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance and remain a single story, the proposal will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other properties in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.
6. The construction of the addition is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for single-family residential purposes.
7. The off-street parking complies with the City zoning requirements.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

Community Development Department (650) 616-7074

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the Summary of Hearing to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 05-24 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 05-24 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.

2. The signed copy of the conditions of approval shall be photocopied and included as a full size page in the Building Division set of drawings.
3. The request for a Use Permit for an addition shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on April 18, 2006, labeled Exhibit B except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.
4. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed. The operation of any equipment or performance of any outside construction related to this project shall not exceed a noise level of 85 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. or exceed 60 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.
5. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
6. The residence shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
7. The garage shall be used for the storage of motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for code enforcement action, which may result in substantial code compliance costs to bring the garage back into conformance.
8. Prior to the submittal of the plans for plan check, the applicant shall redesign the interior of the garage so the garage will maintain an unobstructed area of 20' by 20', in order to comply with the minimum garage dimension per the city's zoning code.
9. Each sleeping room shall have one egress window (5.7 square feet, 24" clear height, 20" clear width).
10. Eaves may not be closer than 3'-0" to property lines.

Department of Public Works - (650) 616-7065

11. Encroachment Permit from Engineering Department required prior to work. S.B.M.C. 8.16.010.
12. No fence, retaining wall, or other permanent structure to be placed within 5'-6" from back of sidewalk. S.B.M.C. 8.08.010.
13. Install a sanitary sewer lateral clean-out at property line per City standards detail SS-01.
14. Erosion control plan and storm water pollution plan required. Must show existing storm drain inlets and other storm water collection locations protect by silt screens or silt fence. Work shall conform with the current NPDES requirements. S.B.M.C. 12.16.020.
15. Storm water from new and existing roof down-spouts and other on-site drainage, shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water system or through an

under sidewalk curb drain to the gutter per City standards detail SI-03. Chapter 11, UPC 1101.1.

16. Applicant shall pay water and sewer capacity charges based on the size of the water meter installed along with materials and installation of water meter. S.B.M.C. 10.14.020/080/110
17. City approved backflow required for domestic and irrigation. Include calculations showing existing or new meter size will be sufficient for required flow. Show location of backflow unit(s) on plans. California Code of Regulations Title 17, U.P.C. 603, S.B.M.C. 10.14.110.

Fire Department - (650) 616-7096

18. Provide minimum 4" illuminated address numbers.
19. Provide manual pull station with a horn and strobe. Obtain fire alarm permit.
20. Provide minimum 2A 10BC fire extinguisher.
21. Rear exit requires minimum 36" wide pathway (ramp) with less than ½" change in grade and exit to the public way.
22. Provide hardwire smoke detectors with battery backup to all bedrooms and corridors/hallways.
23. Provide NFPA 13D Fire Sprinkler System. Obtain fire sprinkler permit.
24. Provide a horn and strobe water flow alarm to be rated for exterior use and have a time delay of 45 to 60 seconds. To be visible from the street.

Planning Commission

25. If applicant proposes more than 6 clients at this facility, further Planning Commission review will be required
26. Revise the plans to show the storage room without a closet and remove the window to make it a storage unit only.

Chair Mishra advised of a 10-day appeal period.

2. 553 Chestnut Avenue

Request for a Use Permit and Minor Modification to allow the construction of an addition to an existing residence which increases the floor area by more than 50%, proposes a floor area greater than 1,825 square feet while only providing a one-car garage and encroaches into the required side yard setbacks per Section 12.200.030.B.1, 12.200.080.A.2, and 12.120.010.B of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Roman Rettner (Applicant) / Manuel Guevara (Owner). UP-06-02, MM-06-02

Planning Manager Aknin entered staff report.

Staff Recommends approval of Use Permit 06-02 and Minor Modification 06-02 subject to an off-street parking redesign and an Architectural Review Committee meeting for

final approval (architectural and parking design) based on Findings of Fact (1-8) and Conditions of Approval (1-20).

Chair Mishra asked Commission if there were any questions for staff.

Commissioner Petersen: Are you also proposing that there is more driveway to park cars in front of the garage door as well?

Planning Manager Akin: No, wouldn't meet 20' length

Commissioner Petersen: On sheet A.2, if cars were as shown, and the door of the garage was moved back with a 16' garage door, you could position the garage door so there is 20' to the back of sidewalk.

Planning Manager Akin: Responds, in staff's recommendation this would go back to ARC if you would want to add that as a condition of approval, we would definitely add that to the conditions.

Commissioner Petersen: Not saying it would be something that would require a little imagination, but evidence on the sheet shows it would work.

Chair Mishra asked the applicant to address the Commission and introduce the project.

Applicant: Manuel Guevara, owner. Proposal is for primary dwelling. Intent for family, wife and 2 children, ages 4 and 2. Works in area. Purchased to be close to family and work. Introduced Architect, Roman Rettner. Worked on modifications on garage as well and would like to propose them tonight. (Presented documentation to commission) Consisting of a single door entrance and looking to expand the door to 9' wide and looking to lowering the slope of the driveway.

Commissioner Petersen: To Applicant. Asked applicant if he heard comment about creating a design that would have a 16' garage door and having a driveway in front that could accommodate 2 cars?

Applicant: Responded Yes.

Commissioner Petersen: Did you consider such a design while working with your designer? Would that be something you would be interested in?

Applicant: Responded No to both questions.

Commissioner Biasotti: What is the reason for a single car garage door?

Applicant: wants to use resources for finishing work

Commissioner Biasotti: why not put the money into the garage door

Architect: Introduced himself, Roman Rettner. Responds that any changes to the existing garage width would mean redesigning building and start all over. It would require us to push the door 20' from the sidewalk. Therefore the second floor would have to be 18" from that level, essentially we would have to redesign.

Public Comment opened.

Public Comment closed.

Commission for discussion

Commissioner Chase: Disagree with intent. Looking at what we were originally proposed, it is his opinion that the architect and applicant are trying to stay within the letter of law and intent as well as retain the character and architecture style of the home that they currently have. Approving the addition and stating that it will set a precedent for future applications, he is uncomfortable with that. I don't feel would be setting a precedent. They are able to fit 2 cars in the garage. He would like to be reassured from counsel that this will indeed be setting a precedent one way or the other. Would like to understand where staff is coming from. The project looks good and they worked hard on it.

City Attorney: Not sure it would be setting a precedent, in a sense that you are going to be reviewing each application on its particular facts. Understands what staff is saying is that just because you can fit two cars in there people will use it that way if it is constructed in such a way that it is difficult to use in that manor. That is the issue before you.

Commissioner Chase: Agrees. Can build the addition and have a 2-car garage, no guarantees that it will be used for 2 cars. If used for storage, it should be fine as long as it is not impacting parking of the street.

Chair Mishra: Respects the letter of the law, but the intent of the law, which is space for two cars, has been satisfied. Regarding the statement "Approving this will set a precedent", requests that the language be toned down.

Commissioner Petersen: Comments that there have been quite a few app for permits and application on chestnut in the past few years. That street has a lot of traffic and short on parking. Understands staff's argument, and the applicant may look around and see recent improvement in the neighborhood. When you are already doing most of the construction, cost and effort it would take to get a two car garage with a two car driveway in front of it, it doesn't seem to be too big a leap to get to the point of asking it to be designed as such. If your position is that the design is workable as it is, I will not disagree with it. On the other hand, if you can achieve what staff is suggesting and get a driveway to provide more parking in front of the house, that advantage is obtainable with much less effort than what might be thought.

Motion to approve Use Permit 06-02, MM06-02 subject to off street parking redesign and Architectural Review Committee meeting for final approval based on Findings of Fact 1-8 and Conditions of Approval 1-20 with comments as above.

Commissioner Chase: If approved it is going back to ARC with changes to accommodate 2 cars in a driveway as well as 2 cars in the garage.

Commissioner Sammut: Iterating the motion once more. Coming back to ARC for a 2-car driveway.

Commissioner Petersen: Responds Correct.

Planning Manager Akin: Petersen is amending staff's recommendation to also include a 2-car driveway.

Commissioner Petersen: Reason making motion that way that it is evident that that is achievable with very little effort. Most of the effort to get the garage larger is already being done by excavating back, which is shown on drawing A2.2.

Commissioner Petersen/Sammur

VOTE: 3-2
AYES: 2
NOES: 3
ABSTAIN:

MOTION FAILED

Discussion:

Commissioner Sammut: Explained why he denied the motion. Agrees with the intent of the law. The fact that they will get 2 cars in the garage, his concern is more with the length of the driveway rather than the width of the driveway. Looking at the plans, the garage can be shortened on the front end creating 20' of space on the driveway, where the new wall comes in, instead of it curving in to the existing garage door if it just went straight across and they knocked back the front portion of the garage, they could generate 20' of driveway then you get 2 cars in the garage and a driveway which you could put a car. The door size is irrelevant as long as you can get the cars in there.

Commissioner Petersen: Acknowledges Commissioner Sammut. Part of Staff's point which as stated, has to do with architectural and building standards and that a significant number of the population won't be able to maneuver into the garage.

Commissioner Chase: Agrees with Sammut. If at all possible to get rid of that curve and increase the driveway space that would be attainable and positive. It would increase value of the home, looking to the future adding more parking. Looking to the intent of the law, voted no on the 2-car driveway, which doesn't seem reasonable. Believes with a little creativity it will be possible.

Commissioner Petersen: Make the motion and allow staff to make the decision.

Commissioner Chase: Put that in the form of a motion.

Motion to approve Use Permit 06-02, MM06-02 based on Findings of Fact 1-8 and Conditions of Approval 1-20 with additional condition to lengthen the driveway to 20'-0".

Commissioner Chase/Petersen

VOTE: 5-0
AYES: All Commissioners Present
NOES:
ABSTAIN:

Motion Passed

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
2. The proposed development will not under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use as the addition will require the applicant to obtain a building permit and all work will be constructed according to the Uniform Building Code.
3. The proposed development will benefit the adjacent property values through investment and not be injurious or detrimental to property and improvement in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City.
4. The construction of the addition is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for single-family residential purposes.
5. Because the proposed addition meets all minimum setback requirements per the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance and/or Minor Modification requirements, the proposal will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and on other property in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof; and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.
6. The general appearance of the proposed addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the design and materials will match the materials found in the immediate neighborhood and the proportions of the house are similar to other houses in the neighborhood.
7. The proposed expansion does not currently comply with applicable off-street parking standards of the zoning ordinance because of the garage entrance design and size of the proposed expansion. Staff is requesting that the applicant redesign to meet minimum zoning requirements.
8. The general appearance of the proposed building or structure, or modification, thereof, is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to adjacent real property because the expansion meets minimum side setbacks per the Minor Modification requirements.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

Community Development Department - (650) 616-7074

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the Summary of Hearing to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 06-002 and Minor Modification 06-002 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 06-002 and Minor Modification 06-002 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.

2. The signed copy of the conditions of approval shall be photocopied and included as a full size page in the Building Division set of drawings.
3. The request for a Use Permit and Minor Modification for an addition shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on March 21, 2006, labeled Exhibit B except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.
4. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed. The operation of any equipment or performance of any outside construction related to this project shall not exceed a noise level of 85 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. or exceed 60 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.
5. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
6. The residence shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
7. The garage shall be used for the storage of motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for code enforcement action, which may result in substantial code compliance costs to bring the garage back into conformance.
8. Prior to approval of this project, applicant shall redesign the garage to be a standard, two-car garage with a 20'-0" wide entrance. At such time, staff will then refer the application back to the Architectural Review Committee for final review and approval.
9. On side of the house, "PG&E meter" shall be 3 feet from windows designed to be opened.

Department of Public Works – (650) 616-7065

10. No fence, retaining wall, or other permanent structure to be placed within 2.2' from back of sidewalk. S.B.M.C. 8.08.010
11. Encroachment Permit from Engineering Department required prior to work. S.B.M.C. 8.16.010
12. Install a sanitary sewer lateral clean-out at property line per City standards detail SS-01.
13. Replace all broken or raised concrete in sidewalk or driveway approach as marked. S.B.M.C. 8.12.010. Marking shall take place under Building Review. It was noted that there are trip hazards where the sidewalk meets the driveway.
14. Erosion control plan and storm water pollution plan required. Must show existing storm drain inlets and other storm water collection locations protect by silt screens or silt fence. Work shall conform with the current NPDES requirements. S.B.M.C. 12.16.020

15. Storm water from new and existing roof down-spouts and other on-site drainage, shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water system or through an undersidewalk curb drain to the gutter per City standards detail SI-03. Chapter 11, UPC 1101.1.
16. Applicant shall pay water and sewer capacity charges based on the size of the water meter installed along with materials and installation of water meter. S.B.M.C. 10.14.020/080/110
17. City approved backflow required for domestic and irrigation. Include calculations showing existing or new meter size will be sufficient for required flow. Show location of backflow unit(s) on plans. California Code of Regulations Title 17, U.P.C. 603, S.B.M.C. 10.14.110

Fire Department - (650) 616-7096

18. Address numbers must be at least four (4) inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background, and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.
19. Provide hardwired smoke detectors with battery backup to all bedrooms and hallways.
20. Provide spark arrestor for chimney.

Planning Commission

21. Redesign the the driveway to meet the required 20'-0" length.

Chair Mishra advised of a 10-day appeal period.

3. 2820 Berkshire Drive

Request for a Use Permit to allow the construction of an addition which exceeds the 44% lot coverage guideline per Section 12.200.030.B.3 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Joe Alberio (Applicant/Owner). UP-06-03

Associate Planner Yu entered staff report. Staff received one comment from 2800 Berkshire. On drainage, submitted to building for review. He will be more satisfied if those conditions are met.

Staff Recommends approval of Use Permit 06-03, based on Findings of Fact 1-6 and Conditions of Approval 1-27.

Chair Mishra asked Commission if there were any questions for staff.

Commissioner Petersen: On condition 10, the wording says "applicant shall implement any measures to mitigate drainage impact onto the adjacent public and private property", that implies that it might lessen the drainage on the adjacent property, but not have the objective of directing all drainage to the street. Would it meet the staff's objectives if it said, "to direct all drainage to the street", instead of *mitigates* or *impacts*?

Associate Planner Yu: No, the drainage on the property must be contained and drained correctly and not onto the street.

Commissioner Petersen: *mitigating* means to lessen impact, not remove. It should be reworded.

Associate Planner Yu: agrees to change to "direct the drainage to the street".

Commissioner Sammut: To Staff, question on the fire dept conditions. Are they in the correct report?

Associate Planner Yu: yes

Commissioner Sammut: "Reads conditions".

Associate Planner Yu: Will verify with the fire department.

Commissioner Sammut: What is a horn and pull station?

Commissioner Petersen: Responds, that it is frequently required with sprinkler systems. Is there an ordinance that requires sprinkling of a structure depending on the water supply in the neighborhood? To Staff, is that the decision making process that resulted in these conditions? Was there insufficient water flow?

Planning Manager Akin: Responds, that is correct, the fire department usually puts the conditions on the fire sprinklers when they make the analysis that they are not going to have enough water pressure to fight a fire, then that might be the reason they put the condition here. Staff will double check the conditions, making sure these were the conditions intended.

Chair Mishra: Looking at the Electrical plan, they are adding new fire sprinklers.

Planning Manager Akin: *Concedes* that application is a proposed as a care facility that requires these conditions.

Chair Mishra asked the applicant to address the Commission and introduce the project.

Applicant: Applicant introduced Owner is absent. Amore, 2910 Berkshire. The existing condition is senior care for maximum of 6, which is licensed by state. Property has been inspected by fire once a year. Paper work is available by request. This additional rooms will be used as office and for storage of documentation that the state requires the owners to keep. Over the years they have accumulate a lot of paperwork, which is currently kept in hallway or garage. This proposed space is for an office.

Chair Mishra: To applicant, are color samples available?

Applicant: Presented color samples. Exterior walls will be the same as existing.

Public Comment opened.

Public Comment closed.

Motion to approve Use Permit 06-03, based on Findings of Fact 1-6 and Conditions of Approval 1-27 with comments as above, modification on condition number 10.

Commissioner Chase/Sammut

VOTE: 5-0
AYES: All Commissioners Present
NOES:
ABSTAIN:

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
2. The proposed addition will not under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use since the applicant will be required to obtain a building permit prior to construction which will ensure that the addition is safely constructed.
3. The proposed addition will not be injurious or detrimental to property and improvement in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city since the applicant will utilize materials found in the immediate neighborhood. Therefore, it will be integrated into the existing neighborhood.
4. The general appearance of the proposed addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the design, scale and materials will match the materials found in the immediate neighborhood and the proportions of the house are similar to other houses in the neighborhood.
5. Because the proposed addition meets all minimum setback requirements per the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance, the proposal will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other properties in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.
6. The construction of the addition is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for single-family residential purposes.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

Community Development Department – (650) 616-7074

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the Summary of Hearing to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 06-03 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 06-03 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The signed copy of the conditions of approval shall be photocopied and included as a full size page in the Building Division set of drawings.
3. The request for a Use Permit for an addition shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on April 18, 2006, labeled Exhibit B except as

required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.

4. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed. The operation of any equipment or performance of any outside construction related to this project shall not exceed a noise level of 85 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. or exceed 60 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.
5. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
6. The structure shall be used only as a small care facility (6 patients or less) or as a single-family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
7. The garage shall be used for the storage of motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for code enforcement action, which may result in substantial code compliance costs to bring the garage back into conformance.
8. Prior to the Final Inspection, the applicant shall install new vegetation between the addition and the street to replace the vegetation that was removed as part of the addition.
9. Restroom in office must meet Chapter 11B requirements and be 100% ADA accessible. Show revision on the Building Division sets of plans.
10. The applicant must submit a drainage plan with the Building Division set of plans to ensure proper drainage in the rear yard. Prior to the final of the building permit, the applicant shall implement any measures to correct the drainage impact on the adjacent public and private property.

Department of Public Works – (650) 616-7065

11. Encroachment Permit from Engineering Department required prior to work. S.B.M.C. 8.16.010.
12. No fence, retaining wall, or other permanent structure to be placed within 3'-6" from back of sidewalk. S.B.M.C. 8.08.010.
13. Install a sanitary sewer lateral clean-out at property line per City standards detail SS-01.
14. Paint address number on face of curb near driveway approach. Black lettering on white background.
15. Erosion control plan and storm water pollution plan required. Must show existing storm drain inlets and other storm water collection locations protect by silt screens or silt fence. Work shall conform with the current NPDES requirements. S.B.M.C. 12.16.020

16. Storm water from new and existing roof down-spouts and other on-site drainage, shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water system or through an under sidewalk curb drain to the gutter per City standards detail SI-03. Chapter 11, UPC 1101.1.
17. Applicant shall pay water and sewer capacity charges based on the size of the water meter installed along with materials and installation of water meter, if changed. S.B.M.C. 10.14.020/080/110
18. Show 10' Public Utility Easement on permit plans.
19. Do not dispose of soil and construction debris within Public Utility Easement.

Fire Department – (650) 616-7096

20. Address numbers must be at least four (4) inches in height, of a contrasting color to the background, and must be lighted during the hours of darkness.
21. Verify horn and strobe with pull station.
22. Provide minimum 2A 10 BC fire extinguisher.
23. Verify all exits have minimum 36" wide pathway with less than ½" change in grade (use ramp if needed) and exit to public way.
24. Provide spark arrestor for chimney.
25. Provide a horn and strobe water flow alarm to be rated for exterior use and have a time delay of 45 to 60 seconds. To be visible from the street. Include with electrical permit.
26. Obtain fire sprinkler permit for additional work. Verify sprinkler coverage in attic.
27. Provide single action lever hardware for all doors. No secondary locking devices such as deadbolts are permitted.

Chair Mishra advised of a 10-day appeal period.

4. 837 5th Avenue

Request for a Minor Modification to allow the construction of an addition, which proposes to continue a legal non-conforming side yard setback. Kamal Singh (Applicant); Anil Kumar (Owner). MM-06-03

Associate Planner Yu entered staff report.

Staff Recommends approval of Minor Modification 06-03, based on Findings of Fact 1-6 and Conditions of Approval 1-18.

Chair Mishra asked Commission if there were any questions for staff.

Chair Mishra asked the applicant to address the Commission and introduce the project.

Applicant: Applicant introduced Kamal Singh. Propose that they are doing 468 sq ft addition at the rear of the existing house. From street the addition will not be seen, as per the elevation drawings. The set backs are being met which are existing and are meeting the 4' and 6' setbacks. They are building a master bedroom and moving the

laundry from garage into the proposed addition. With the parking area, with the existing single car garage, which is about 10' would also like to increase by 8' as to have a car parked in the garage, instead of the street. Will remain a one story residence.

Chair Mishra to staff: for this app, just considering the minor modification which is just for the 4' set back and not for the interior configuration.

Planning Manager Akin: Responds correct, it's for the set back itself and could have been done at the ARC meeting level, but due to agenda conflicts and noticing the requirements brought it to the planning commission. For the minor modification for the encroachment into the side set back.

Chair Mishra: what if he felt it wasn't a single family home.

Planning Manager Akin: Believes there's a condition that it must function as a single family residence, so we can continue to enforce that. If condition is not there, we can add it.

Chair Mishra: can he comment?

Planning Manager Akin: yes, you can comment if you think it is not consistent with a single family home.

Commissioner Petersen: to applicant. Regarding floor plan. There is a bedroom next to dining room; this also applies to bedroom next to that, that's on the side of the house, can't see how you get in and out of them.

Applicant: yes there are doors, not shown on drawings. Pointed out locations.

Commissioner Petersen: the way to get to the room is thru dining room?

Applicant: yes

Commissioner Petersen: are you planning any closet area in corner bedroom?

Applicant: There is an existing closet in the corner of the bedroom.

Commissioner Petersen: won't effect vote, but when there is a number of aspects unclear or maybe even wrong, recommends a better set of plans prior to building. For record, can you state this plan represents what you will build?

Applicant: affirmative

Chair Mishra: To applicant, prior to leaving please mark the doors on the city's set of plans.

Public Comment opened.

Speaker #1: Roberto Perdomo, 845 5th Avenue, next door neighbor. Problem with previous owner with bushes next to driveway. New owner cut bushes and tore down a wall and built a wall at the edge of his property. Now has more wall and flowers into his property. At least a foot onto his property. Has pictures to present. The fence is now not straight.

Commissioner Petersen: Questioned applicant which side he was on.

Applicant: Responded on the garage side. If this Project is going to effect him, would like to be reassured that it won't. Wants to make sure that they will not cross his property line. Would like applicant to fix the fence.

Chair Mishra: Accepts comments and will be discussed.

Public Comment closed.

Commissioner Petersen: to staff, since this minor modification is on the garage side, correct? Perceives a nexus between this app and the location of the property line and based on that would like a requirement put in that the property line be surveyed and a bench mark established at the front part where the property line intersects the right away parallel to the street.

Planning Manager Akin: Responded it is reasonable, since they are asking for an exception to the setback requirement.

Commissioner Petersen: it would then not be difficult to place a bench mark within a few feet of the rear property line so that a straight line could then be established between the property.

Planning Manager Akin: Correct, we will require a survey that whole side property line.

Commissioner Chase: Comment on Commissioner Petersen's comments to the applicant on the plan, definitely not as complete as most plans that come before us. Maybe staff could give some guidance to applicants to present better plans.

Planning Manager Akin: Agrees and understood. Will have better plans when they do their structural plans.

Motion to Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve Minor Modification 06-03 based on Findings for Approval (1-7) and Conditions of Approval (1-16), with added condition #17 that applicant provide a survey and have a benchmark placed within a few feet of the front of the property and a few feet in the back of the property on the property line adjacent to the garage.

Commissioner Petersen/Chase

Mishra: Adds #18 Condition of Approval that this will be a single family residence.

Petersen: Requests that The city is provided with copy of survey and that staff inspects that the benchmarks are established according to reasonable performance standards, sufficient to last through weather and time.

Akin: Requests to add the survey is done prior to permit issuance.

Commissioner Petersen/Chase

VOTE: 5-0
AYES: All Commissioners Present
NOES:

ABSTAIN:

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. The Minor Modification to construct an addition resulting in a 1'-0" encroachment into the required side yard setback at 837 Fifth Avenue will not be injurious or detrimental to properties and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city because the addition will remain a single story, thereby not creating significant shadow on the adjacent property.
2. The general appearance of the reduced setback is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood because the reduced setback will be located to the rear of the existing residence and will not alter the appearance of the residence from the street.
3. The reduced setback will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the proposed addition is designed at the same height as the existing structure with a gable roof parallel to the property to the right, and with only two additional small windows on the right side elevation, therefore reducing the potential impact of the addition to the adjacent neighbor and providing for the maximum privacy and enjoyment of their property
4. The construction of the addition to the existing residence is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for low-density residential purposes.
5. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing private facility.
6. The off-street parking complies with the City's zoning ordinance.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Community Development – (650) 616-7074

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the "Architectural Review Meeting Minutes" to the Department of Community Development within 30 days of approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, the Minor Modification Permit (MM-06-03) shall not be valid for any purpose. The Minor Modification permit shall expire one (1) year from the date of approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the expiration date.
2. The proposal to build an addition at 837 Fifth Avenue shall be built according to the plans on file in the Planning Department and approved by the Architectural Review Committee on April 13, 2006, except as required to be modified by these conditions of approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior review and approval by the Community Development Director.
3. The applicant shall obtain a City building permit before construction can proceed.
4. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City.

5. This application is subject to all future conditions of the Building Division at time of Building Division submittal.

Public Works Department – (650) 616-7065

6. Encroachment Permit from Engineering Department required prior to work. S.B.M.C. 8.16.010
7. No fence, retaining wall, or other permanent structure to be placed within 2'-0" from back of sidewalk. S.B.M.C. 8.08.010
8. Install a sanitary sewer lateral clean-out at property line per City standards detail SS-01.
9. Paint address number on face of curb near driveway approach. Black lettering on white background.
10. Replace all broken or raised concrete in sidewalk or driveway approach as marked. S.B.M.C. 8.12.010. Marking shall take place under Building Review.
11. Erosion control plan and storm water pollution plan required. Must show existing storm drain inlets and other storm water collection locations protect by silt screens or silt fence. Work shall conform with the current NPDES requirements. S.B.M.C. 12.16.020
12. Storm water from new and existing roof down-spouts and other on-site drainage, shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water system or through an undersidewalk curb drain to the gutter per City standards detail SI-03. Chapter 11, UPC 1101.1.
13. Applicant shall pay water and sewer capacity charges based on the size of the water meter installed along with materials and installation of water meter, if change is required. S.B.M.C. 10.14.020/080/110
14. City approved backflow required for domestic and irrigation. Include calculations showing existing or new meter size will be sufficient for required flow. Show location of backflow unit(s) on plans. California Code of Regulations Title 17, U.P.C. 603, S.B.M.C. 10.14.110

Fire Department – (650) 616-7096

15. Provide minimum 4" illuminated address numbers.
16. Provide spark arrestor for chimney if present.

Planning Commission

17. Applicant shall provide a survey and have a benchmark placed within a few feet of the front of the property and a few feet in the back of the property on the property line adjacent to the garage.
18. The home shall be a single family residence only.

Chair Mishra advised of a 10-day appeal period.

5. 100 Skycrest Center

Conflict of interest with Commissioner Biasotti who recused himself at this time.

***Staff is requesting continuance to the May 2, 2006 Planning Commission meeting.**

Request for a Vesting Tentative Tract Map for the subdivision of one lot to 25 lots with common space, and a Planned Development Permit to allow the development of 24 new homes, per Chapter 12 of the San Bruno Municipal Code. Kenmark Real Estate Group, Applicant, Willow Green Associates, Owner. PDP-06-01, TM-06-01

Planning Manager Aknin made request for continuance.

Chair Mishra asked Commission if there were any questions for staff.

Motion to approve continuance until May 2, 2006

Commissioner Petersen/Chase

VOTE: 4-0
AYES: All Commissioners Present
NOES:
ABSTAIN:

Biasotti Returns

6. 461 El Camino Real

Request for a Parking Exception to allow a covered patio to the rear of an existing restaurant per Section 12.100.010.A of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Isaac Mejia (Applicant), Anstell Ricossa (Owner) PE-06-02

Director Heyden: Applicant called to request a continuance. Staff supports continuance and code enforcement case will not be hindered because of this continuance.

Motion to approve Continuance.

Commissioner Petersen/Chase

VOTE: 5-0
AYES: All Commissioners Present
NOES:
ABSTAIN:

F. Discussion

1. City Staff Discussion

- a. Select May 11, 2006 Architectural Review Committee Members
Commissioners Petersen, and Biasotti; Chase as back up.

Planning Manager Aknin will call absent members

b. City Attorney – Conflict of Interest

Brief description. New law AB1234, requiring 2 hours of ethics training. Training is being offered throughout the year. Additional opportunities to attend will be forwarded as they are announced.

City Attorney is there to offer guidance in offering analysis of the conflict of Interest.

2. Planning Commission Discussion

Attendance at California League

Commissioner Biasotti, attended, some ideas. Parking exceptions, wondering if staff would be interested in bringing some of those ideas to our plan.

Form based zoning. If staff would look into and see if we could bring those ideas into our city plan.

Planning Manager Aknin: When we come back with more research we will have better and detailed answers and examples.

Commissioner Biasotti: General plan Evaluation. Has a PDF file, happy to share with the commission.

Another idea was that the average person attends a planning commission meeting once in their lifetime, discussed that maybe we should have a greeter explaining the process, prior to the meeting, so they are more informed and better able to participate

Commissioner Biasotti: Thanks to Tony Rozzi for getting things the Planning Commission Minutes and Agendas on line.

Commissioner Chase: Observation, putting required findings in bold in the staff reports, something new?.

Aknin: Yes, we have utilized that process in all applications instead of just the larger ones.

Commissioner Chase: Commends Staff.

Chair Mishra: Handed out CDs from conference there is also notes – slideshows on line soon, check website.

Chair Mishra: To Staff. Can we convert some of those streets downtown to one way streets in the general plan, some streets are so narrow, no bike lane, and with parking on both sides of street, difficult for cars to pass. A street such as Sylvan has many cars driving very fast, wanted research on that.

Chair Mishra: Wants some investigation. For evacuation plan, reduce future gridlock downtown.

Chair Mishra: Some investigation on amenities, such as Cal Tran towers or control boxes, can we influence them to do murals?

Commissioner Petersen: Application E3 and E4, conditions were treated differently on drainage. Suggest staff adopts pre written conditions and applying them to each application, use those and modify as needed rather than writing a new one.

Assistant Planner Rozzi: Explained measures used on those applications.

Commissioner Chase: Regarding Residential care – some comments that are made – reality is not really what happens. Is there a way to track the emergency to these facilities?

G. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 9:03 pm

Tambri Heyden

Secretary to the Planning Commission
City of San Bruno

Sujendra Mishra, Chair

Planning Commission
City of San Bruno

NEXT MEETING: May 16, 2006

TH/ch